DOCUMENT RESUME

HE 000 260

ED 025 215

By- Palola, Ernest G.

Statewide Planning and Students: New Conceptions of the Campus.

California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

Pub Date 29 Oct 68

Note- 17p.; Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y., October 29, 1968.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.95

Descriptors- *Educational Quality, *Governance, *Higher Education, Master Plans, Policy Formation, *School Expansion, State Programs, Student College Relationship, Student Interests, *Student Needs

Identifiers- *Statewide Planning

Statewide planning has been generally based on institutional expansion and capacity rather than educational quality and student needs. Institutional change has usually resulted from pressures for economy and efficiency by state planners. In a 2-year study of statewide planning in 4 states (California, New York, Illinois and Florida), the Center attempted to identify how decisions made outside of institutions affected their missions and roles. Florida is developing 2 state institutions based on the "senior institution" concept, one of which - through "villages" or residential colleges - also offers a tightly integrated living-learning arrangement for faculty and students. The State of Illinois has approved construction of 2 institutions based on a senior institution-commuter model. A new challenge for higher education is to develop new teaching-learning processes that would meet the growing demands of an increasingly diverse range of students. University faculty, administrators and students have not usually participated in the development of proposals which eventually alter the basic concepts and purposes of their institutions. Very few statewide plans, therefore, include approaches to more academic effectiveness. It is proposed that educators should, in the interest of future patterns of higher education, demand thorough analyses of state plans before they are implemented and more intensive evaluations once they are operational. (WM)

STATEWIDE PLANNING AND STUDENTS

NEW CONCEPTIONS OF THE CAMPUS

Ernest G. Palola
Research Sociologist

Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education

University of California
Berkeley, California

ED025215

Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the College Entrance Examination Board, October 29, 1968, New York, New York.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED025215

HE 000 260

STATEWIDE PLANNING AND STUDENTS

NEW CONCEPTIONS OF THE CAMPUS

> ...What is the Central imperative of university administration today? Growth. Growth is necessary to meet the demands of articulate publics, and executive and legislative bodies, for more places for the young. Growth is necessary to satisfy the demands of the many clusters of faculty for more resources and personnel. Growth is seen as asbolutely necessary for strength against other colleges and universities. ...For the administrative class in the multiversities, there is no answer other than expansion. They therefore become possessed by a logic of growth. They can wish for quality, seek quality, and of course always talk about quality; but growth is what motivates them and sets the framework for consideration of quality. (Burton R. Clark, "The New University," The American Behavioral Scientist, May-June, 1968, p. 2.)

Introduction

In one sense statewide planning in higher education is an exclusively student-oriented activity. Mushrooming enrollments subsequent to World War II and mounting college attendance rates during the 50's and 60's resulted in new institutions being constructed and existing ones being forced to expand their capacities manifold. Many educators were uneasy about the rate and scope of this growth. Little serious thought or debate was possible regarding the long-range impact of this expansion on existing programs and methods of instruction. Nevertheless, these expansions occurred, multiversities emerged, and the junior college movement was significantly accelerated.

But in another sense, statewide planning has treated students in only a superficial way. The problem for statewide planning has been primarily quantitative, and this means that students have been considered in planning mainly in a numerical or statistical sense. According to

some critics, this is an ugly, faceless and impersonal way of thinking about students; it is much akin to counting and sorting cattle, pigs, sheep, rocks, leaves, trees, fishes, and bugs. References in statewide plans that reflect this non-human perspective toward the student include: enrollment counts and projections, class size and teaching loads, level and type of instruction, costs of instruction and student-faculty ratios, space utilization and square footage per student, and student-credit-hour productivity. But with the growing concern about the basic aims and purposes of higher education presently espoused in junior colleges, state colleges, or universities, a change may be required in the basic emphasis of statewide planning.

In a strikingly different way, students could be thought of in statewide plans as people, people with values and interests, people with opinions and perspectives, people who care about what kind of education they receive and about how colleges and universities attempt to "shape and mold" them according to some pre-defined notion of what is "good," "appropriate," "expected," and "necessary." A glimpse of this concern and perspective was apparent in a searing appraisal of campus facilities planning written by students and which appeared in The Daily Californian under the title, "A Blistering Analysis of Campus Planning on the Local and University-Wide Levels." The main points of the analysis stand out in the following statement:

> In practice these guidelines (Master Plan maximum population figures and Re-Study space standards) fundamentally distort the nature of the university. First, they impose what might be called a 'growth rate theory of University governance' more appropriate to budget planning than to educational policy. Second, they rationalize and quantify

> the criteria for spatial planning so completely that the qualitative concerns and desires for innovating and informal facilities become inadmissible as planning justifications. (The Daily California, May 4, 1967, p. 6.)

It is probably not surprising, then, to find that even though what statewide planning is all about is students (at least in one sense), students generally have no participatory role in statewide planning, or even in planning within most local institutions for that matter. Mario Savio's essay on the University of California contains the following observation:

> The history of the adoption of the Master Plan and a careful study of the Muscatine Report show that faculty members and students are consistently excluded from those groups of legislators, bureaucrats, and businessman which make the most far-reaching decisions concerning the development and reform of the University. Those of us whose lives are directly involved are denied any effective voice in these decisions which structure and pervert our immediate, daily environment. (Mario Savio, "The Uncertain Future of the Multiversity," Harper's Magazine, October, 1966, p. 94)

However, this situation may be changing. Increasingly, students are being appointed to various faculty and administrative committees. Only recently, a meeting of student-body presidents of the state colleges in California drafted a "Bill of Rights" in which they establish the principle that the participation of students in the development of college-wide policies and procedures is necessary and expected. A different view is emerging on many campuses across the nation where faculty, students, administrators, and trustees all share in institutional governance and planning. Each group is considered to have a unique perspective, type of expertise and particular contribution to make.

It is probably not surprising either to observe that some proposals in statewide plans--new institutional types, major shifts in enrollment mix, new methods of instruction, and new programs--are made with very little systematic research on students in other than quantitative terms. And very often when these recommendations are implemented, only fragmented efforts are made to evaluate the successes and failures or the advantages and disadvantages of new arrangements and contrasting designs. This situation is, of course, due to a large extent to the limitations of time, staff, and finances. Even so, it is the responsibility of all educators to press for more thorough analyses of new proposals before they are implemented and more intensive evaluations once they are operational.

Here is the central theme of the this paper. The primary challenge for education subsequent to World War II and the post-Sputnik decade was the new commitment to universal higher education. This challenge is being met through the proposals for expansion contained in state plans. However, these growth plans generally lack sensitivity to the needs of an increasingly diverse range of students. Their interests are not adequately met by the older more traditional forms and processes of education. Thus, the new challenge for higher education is to develop ways by which teaching/learning processes and campus social structures can effectively meet the demands of a more diverse student body.

In this paper, we shall examine the contents of statewide plans that suggest fundamental change in traditional conceptions of the campus. More specifically, we shall first, describe selected proposals of state

plans, second, emphasize that many of these proposals are primarily the result of pressures for economy and efficiency, and third, suggest some of the basic educational issues and questions generated by these proposals.

The Center's Work on Planning

The staff of the Center has been studying various aspects of planning and coordination in higher education for ten years. Lyman Glenny conducted his twelve-state survey of statewide coordination during the late 50's; T.R. McConnell published his book in 1962, A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education, which focused mainly on planning and and coordination in California; Leland Medsker and George Clark undertook a major survey of junior colleges in California which was a major force underlying the newly created Board of Governors; and Gilbert Paltridge recently completed two studies of conflict and change in the form and process of statewide coordination for higher education in Wisconsin and California.

During the last two years the Center has conducted a study of statewide planning and its institutional effects in four states--California, Florida, Illinois, and New York. The major thrust of this study was to identify how critical decisions made outside institutions affect their mission and roles. Some 600 interviews were conducted with state officials, legislators, state coordinators for higher education, and faculty and administrators of 81 institutions. These data are now being analyzed and it is anticipated that a report will be available by the end of this year. The observations reviewed below are based primarily on this four-state study.

New Conceptions of the Campus

Many different ideas and recommendations are contained in statewide plan which have important implications for the evolving character of higher education. Most of these recommendations, in one way or another, focus on students. A listing of some of these topics include: expanding scholarship programs, establishing uniform probation and dismissal standards and procedures, raising entrance requirements, reporting on grading practices, studying entrance requirements and their validity, establishing statewide testing programs, evaluating guidance services, expanding counseling programs, and increasing the student capacity of existing campuses. Since it is impossible to examine and discuss each of the several proposals, certain ones were chosen since they more directly affect the fundamental character and integrity of existing and proposed institutions in terms of their mission and role, curriculum and instructional practices, student mix and campus culture--in short, those proposals that lead to new conceptions of the campus.

New Types of Institutions

Many states are experimenting with and developing new, or at least, different concepts of colleges and universities. Florida is attempting, for example, to develop two state universities based on the "senior institution" concept. Essentially, this means, on paper, little more than accommodating expanded upper division enrollments. However, in the case of Florida Atlantic University and the University of West Florida, much more is involved. At Florida Atlantic, which opened in September, 1964, the faculty and administration have also been attempting to implement

such principles as : (1) the student is to have increased responsibility for his own learning, (2) the curricula of the various programs are to be confined to fundamentals, and (3) the university is to be equipped with audio-visual and television facilities to permit the extension of teaching productivity beyond the conventional classroom situation. More recently, the University is developing a School of Technology to move the junior college student to more advanced levels in certain applied and technical areas. And the University of West Florida, which opened fall, 1967, is attempting to follow several of the ideas which distinguish Florida Atlantic as a senior institution. But in addition, the idea of "villages" or residential colleges, each a part of the University but each having an identity of its own, is being implemented at the University of West Florida. Under this concept, a more tightly integrated living-learning arrangement is expected, residence halls and faculty offices are designed to afford close personal relationships among students and faculty. In fact, each commuting student will be a member of a resident college and will be given every possible opportunity to participate.

Florida Atlantic was also originally planned as a commuter institution but due primarily to problems of transportation, along with other factors, this has resulted in the recent construction of dormitories. There is even some discussion of adding lower division students. This type of institution relies heavily on junior college transfer students and thus creates a very strong impetus to develop effective articulation agreements and arrangements. Although many steps have been taken, the problem of articulation is still generic to the junior-senior design in Florida.

More recently, the State of Illinois approved the construction of two degree-granting institutions based on the senior institution-commuter model. One institution will be located in suburban Chicago and the other in Springfield. In an explanatory section on "policies for commuter institutions" in the 1966 Plan, the Board of Higher Education stressed the cost savings features of such institutions and avoids consideration of their educational consequences:

> Considering the high mobility of urban populations and the rate of in-migration to the city areas, it would seem unlikely that resident students could improve on the existing heterogeneity of urban college youth. Moreover, (1) the high cost of land dictates the conservation of avialable campus space for instructional rather than residential buildings, (2) auxiliary services for residential students inflate operational costs above those for commuting students, and (3) these institutions are initiated to serve primarily local populations rather than attract students from other regions served by established higher institutions, both public and nonpublic. (State of Illinois Board of Higher Education, A Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois, Phase II- Extending Educational Opportunity, December, 1966, p. 31.)

These types of institutional patterns raise many key questions about educational policy and practice. Very little research data are available to guide discussions and decisions. Even more important is the fact that few plans show evidence that in-depth studies of these cases are being contemplated. Such issues and questions as the following are being raised about these new concepts: First, is it possible for junior colleges to provide students with university-parallel instruction so that they are adequately prepared for upper division work at senior institutions? Second, is there sufficient instructional work at the upper division level in a senior institution to justify fully staffed departments

across all disciplines? Third, how important are extra-curricular learning experiences and college climate or culture in the more traditional four-year residential institution, and in what important ways are these experiences altered or modified within the context of a commuter or senior institution? Fourth, what impact does the junior-senior design have on the recruitment of majors into the various academic disciplines? Dorothy Knoell aptly describes the growing significance of articulation as increasing numbers of lower division students are diverted (as a result of state plan recommendations) to junior colleges when she says:

> ...The net effect is to reduce drastically the number of degree candidates who take their entire program at the undergraduate level in one institution, with one prescription of standards and requirements. As more and more students begin and complete a substantial part of their program elsewhere, the problems of coordination of student programs and services among and between college institutions increase. (Dorothy Knoell, "Chaos or Coordination?" University Review, Summer, 1967, p. 22)

A similar but somewhat different set of questions are also being posed about the recommendations in statewide plans to reduce lower division work in major universities. The basic rationale for such recommendations is that junior colleges "can do the job cheaper." This type of recommendation, however, is often received only reluctantly at major universities since one, the educational soundness of the idea is questioned, but two, budgeting procedures are designed to favor those institutions with large and expanding enrollments. That is, considerable income is generated by lower division students. Since these students are often taught en masse, some of the funds generated by large lower division enrollments can be used for other purposes.

New Instructional Techniques

New instructional techniques can be used either to increase the efficiency of educational enterprises or their academic effectiveness. Most statewide plans have focused almost exclusively on the former alternative. A variety of means are discussed in statewide plans to affect greater economies in and suggest more varied uses of instructional resources. Just to name a few, these include: closed-circuit television, learning resources centers, computerized libraries, international education, work-study programs, teaching machines, programmed textbooks, interdisciplinary team teaching, scholar-exchange programs, living-learning centers, computer dial access systems, and the like. Obviously, these various techniques and approaches raise a host of complicated questions about the teaching/learning process (about which we know very little to begin with) and about the most effective instructional approaches for which kinds of students, in which academic areas, and used by which types of faculty.

Even more challenging are some items being discussed within State University of New York and other systems to the effect that there may be no such thing as the campus, classroom instruction, face-to-face student-professor interaction, dormitories, libraries, administrators, research centers, faculty, lectures, or books in the traditional ways we think about these topics. In a recent issue of The Futurist, the ideas of several persons about inventing education for tomorrow are reviewed. Some of the ideas include:

Learning to learn, rather than absorbing predigested knowledge or a preplanned diet, will become the heart and soul of education. (Robert E. Bickner)

...the teaching of specific courses and certifying students at institutions of the kind that are familiar today, where people crowd behind school building walls, will soon become a thing of the past. (Ralph Gerard)

...the lecture disappearing as a method of imparting information...computerized courses for teaching such subjects as statistics and German greatly speed up a student's learning. (Ralph Gerard)

...education should place less emphasis on such values as objectivity and analysis and more on originality and synthesis. (Marvin Adelson)

The concept of a student as someone between the age of 18 and 22 disappears. It becomes possible, in short, to think of all men as students. Communiversity decentralizes learning to the learner whoever he is and therefore, ideally, to the community as a whole. It places responsibility for the achievement of the objectives on the learner where it has always rested, but places responsibility for creating the environment for achievement and growth squarely on the institution as a whole. (Hendrick D. Gideonse)

Although statewide planning in Illinois, to pick one other setting, raises interesting possibilities for new approaches to instruction, very few of their proposals have yet been implemented nor have students themselves been questioned as to what they might consider to be educationally useful. One could only hope that future statewide planning can overcome its present conservatism regarding the qualitative dimension of education. More energy should be expended toward not only facilitating the examination of new techniques and approaches to the teaching/learning process but also reaching beyond a 5 to 10 year time frame. There are so many basic educational issues to be debated that an approach to planning which in the main is concerned with quantitative-economic issues may be a very short-sighted and disastrous path to pursue.

Oettinger, in a recent essay critical of systems analysis and the and the innovation fad, subscribes to a qualitatively-oriented style of thinking about education when he says:

> However wasteful in appearance, it fits my prejudices best to encourage as much diversity as possible--as many different paths, as many different outlooks, as many different experiments, as many different initiatives as we can afford once the demands of education have been balanced against those of other needs of our society. We should plan for the encouragement of pluralism and diversity, at least in technique. (Anthony G. Oettinger, "The Myths of Educational Technology," Saturday Review, September 23, 1967, p. 91)

And he strongly urges more thorough studies of current teaching/learning processes concomitant with some experimentation with new approaches and techniques.

> There is too much rigidity even in the present innovation fad which, ironically, diverts human and financial resources from both basic research and sustained application and evaluation efforts into the most visible quickie approaches that can sustain the illusion of progress. (Ibid.)

New Program Foci

Even though past experience in statewide planning has dealt only minimally with issues beyond those of quantitative growth, manpower needs, and the economical utilization of limited resources, recent activities demonstrate a marked shift to some broader issues. Interestingly, one finds references to, discussions about, and recommendation concerning the educationally deprived, disadvantaged, or handicapped. A few colleges and universities, and according to John Gardner's recent remarks, too few, are searching for new ways to meet the demands of broader spectrum of student needs within the urban setting. For example,

due to proding from the governor and legislature, the Regents in the State of New York have concentrated a great deal of attention on the educational opportunity in the total state system by establishing special programs to assist the educationally handicapped in gaining a college-level education. Special financial-aid programs have also been established by the Regents. In conjunction with SUNY and CUNY, the Regents have backed the creation of urban skills centers, the S.E.E.K. Program, the Career Discovery Program, the Occupational Skills Program, the Work and Study Program, the College Adapter Program and the Job Related Certificate Program. So far, CUNY has been the most progressive system in establishing such programs.

These special activities undertaken by certain universities are extremely important given the magnitude of current socio-economic-cultural problems. It is unfortunate that colleges and universities, in the main, have been so late in mounting these important programs. However, this is explainable, in good part, given the overly economy-expansionist-efficiency orientation of most statewide plans. But in addition, obstacles arise among the ranks of local faculty and administrators as well, for they have their traditional vested interests to protect. New commitments upon an already overly-extended budget require soul-searching and hard decisions, the likes of which few faculty or administrators or legislators are willing to face.

One other development within the category of new program foci should be mentioned. This too has crucial importance to our traditional conception of the campus. Furthermore, it introduces additional commit-

ments and the likelihood of new funding sources. The area to which we allude, more familiarly referred to as extension, continuing education, and/or adult education, is emerging now under the newer labels of "life-long learning," "mid-career re-training," and the like. These ideas signify the beginning of an entirely different and exceedingly important reconceptualization of what constitutes post-secondary education. And once again, it challenges us to reassess not only what it is that colleges and universities ought to be teaching students, but by what methods and organizational patterns this can best be achieved. Clark states this point well when he says:

> ...If we did not know it before, we know it now--good scholars and good students can make a bad educational system. Everything depends on how they are put together. Unless administrators and faculty learn to ask about the quality of interaction on campus, and take that line of inquiry as basic rather than as 'interesting,' the new university will be an ineffectual social system... (Clark, op. cit., p. 5)

Although restrictions of space prevent a fuller treatment of other ideas and developments, they should be noted at the very least. First, year-round operation has received much interest and considerable flack recently. In Florida, for example, in a five-year period almost all patterns of year-round operation yet conceived by man were successively implemented. The apparent rationale was economy and efficiency but the end result was more akin to financial mismanagement and educational havoc. Other states have had similar experiences. The experience in California with year-round operation has been described as follows:

> The Berkeley faculty declared itself clearly opposed to the quarter system of year-round operation. (The quarter system too is part of the Master Plan.) Nevertheless, despite the expressed will of the faculty, in the interests of economic efficiency the campus is going off the traditional semester system beginning this fall...(Savio, op. cit., p. 99)

Second, following the motto, "grow larger while remaining small," new internal structures (cluster experiments) are being created with the intent to "humanize," "personalize," and "individualize" the college campus. A few of the public institutions with this plan are: University of California at Santa Cruz, Michigan State University, State University of New York at Stony Brook, University of North Carolina, and University of Indiana. An important condition, though, that often is placed on these innovative efforts once the legislature endorses the plan is: "That it shal cost no more than a conventional campus."

Conclusion

We have discussed a few ways in which the more traditional conceptions of higher education institutions are being altered or fundamentally changed by proposals made in state plans. Some proposals are superficial, fadistic, and smack of gimmickry, while others, although seemingly innocuous, create major alterations, and still other recommendations openly and directly transform the design and process of higher education. Such observations as the following need emphasis: First, institutional change prompted by state plans very often reflects pressures for economy and efficiency. Less often is basic change the result of a new or modified philosophy of education. Second, very little work is being done as part of long-range planning in higher education to assess the

outcomes of various changes. Third, only minimal attention is paid to the basic interests, attitudes, and opinions of students as regards the type of education needed, the alternative ways of designing new structures and processes, and the way in which change of a particular type can best be effected. And lastly, colleges and universities have been remiss in bowing to the pressures of quantitatively-biased statewide planners. Many fundamental questions about the future patterns of higher education are being set, either directly or indirectly, by the information collected and decisions taken by state planners.

William Arrowsmith, in his critique of teaching in colleges and universities, makes the following point which seems equally applicable to the seeming opposition between the purposes of statewide planning and the interests of students:

> Innovation, experiment, reform--these are crucial, and the pity is that, apart from a few noteworthy experiments, there is so little real innovation. Wherever one looks, there is the same vacuum of leadership, the same failure of nerve. For this, I believe administrators must shoulder the blame, or most of it. It is idle to expect anything from the faculties, who are caught both in the hideous jungle of academic bureaucracy and in their own professional lethargy. Nor can one look to the providential intervention of the foundations; they can perhaps fund imagination and courage, but they cannot, apparently, provide it. It is, above all, to local institutions--the colleges, the universities--that one must turn. They are funded by communities--the states, alumni student fees--and therefore they have a responsibility to the community that supports them, and most of all to that general culture that I have identified with the ideal role of the teacher. (William Arrowsmith, "The Future of Teaching," The Journal of Higher Education, March, 1967, p. 137.)